

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,511	09/28/2001	Deral T. Mosbey	55837US002	4740

7590 11/20/2002

Doreen S. L. Gwin  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
P.O. Box 33427  
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

BERMAN, ALYSIA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/966,511

Applicant(s)

LU ET AL

Examiner

Alysia Berman

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 and 66-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 53-61 and 71-75 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 66-70 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment and information disclosure statement filed August 7, 2002. Claim 27 has been amended. Claims 66-75 have been added. Claims 62-65 have been canceled. Claims 53-61 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. The status of claims 1-52 and 66-75 are as follows.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Newly submitted claims 71-75 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the original claims did not identify a specific species of vinyl polymer. An election of species was required from which Applicant elected a species of polymer different from the polymer species claimed in new claims 71-75. Therefore, claims 71-75 are directed to a non-elected species of the invention that was not previously presented.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 71-75 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

This application contains claims drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 3. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed August 7, 2002 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the document provided does not have a publication date. Applicant's statement that the publication date of the document is prior to September 28, 2001 is not sufficient. The Examiner is unable to determine if the document provided on the information disclosure statement is prior art. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-28, 32-36, 38-40 and 42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are vague and indefinite because it is unclear what Applicant intends by an alkyl-Y containing side chain having at least 4 carbon atoms on average. It

Art Unit: 1617

unclear how a chemical compound can contain an average number of atoms. This rejection is maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 661 964 B1 (964) in view of EP 0 011 806 (806).

This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the Office Action mailed May 7, 2002, paper no. 4.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 66-70 are allowed.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 7, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, EP '964 teaches water-in-oil emulsion compositions that contain vinyl polymers. EP '806 teaches that emulsions containing vinyl polymers corresponding to the instantly claimed vinyl polymers thicken aqueous composition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the vinyl polymer of EP '806 to the water-in-oil emulsion of EP '964 expecting to thicken the emulsion.

Applicant argues that there is no reasonable expectation of success in adding vinyl polymers with ethylene oxide and carboxylic acid groups to water-in-oil emulsions. This is not found persuasive because EP '806 clearly discloses at lines 1-2 of page 2 that emulsions containing the vinyl polymers thicken aqueous compositions. A water-in-oil emulsion is considered an aqueous composition.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., water-in-oil emulsions that do not include acidic components) are not recited in the

Art Unit: 1617

rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that some preferred embodiments of the instant invention are directed to using the compositions on the skin, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

In response to Applicants arguments that carboxylic functional polymers are typically not capable of stabilizing water-in-oil emulsions at low pH, Applicant has not provided any evidence of record to support this statement. Showings of facts are much preferred to statements of opinion. *In re Oelrich*, 198 USPQ 210, 215 (CCPA 1978). Additionally, the instant claims do not contain a limitation directed to low pH.

In response to Applicant's argument that EP '806 requires greater carboxylic acid monomer than the instant invention. Firstly, it is noted that this argument is not commensurate in scope with the instant independent claims. Further, it is considered within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters in a composition in order to achieve a beneficial effect. *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 198). It would



Art Unit: 1617

have been obvious for one skilled in the art to vary the proportions of components in a composition to arrive at the best compositions for the intended purpose. "It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Only if the "results optimizing a variable" are "unexpectedly good" can a patent be obtained for the claimed critical range. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6, 8 (CCPA 1977); see also *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 692, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1901 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (in banc). Applicant has not provided any evidence of record showing unexpected results with no more than about 0.1 wt.% copolymerized acidic monomers over the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1617

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alysia Berman whose telephone number is 703-308-4638. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on 703-305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 or 703-872-9307 for after-final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1234 or 703-308-1235.

  
Alysia Berman  
Patent Examiner  
November 14, 2002

  
RUSSELL TRAVERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200